

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5336	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Zone 7 Water Agency	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$387,000
PROJECT TITLE	Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$552,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop the Watershed Management and Habitat Protection and Restoration and Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Functional Area Documents. Develop an IRWMP to achieve greater efficiencies, enhance public services, and build public support for vital plans and projects pertaining to management of Bay Area water and natural resources.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 12

Comment: Work plan is complete and includes work items and deliverables consistent with the schedule and budget. Individual task descriptions are generalized and could include more specific outcomes. It is not clear from reading the proposal scope and budget how duties within each task will be distributed or funded between partner agencies. There appears to be a need for clear milestones throughout to keep process on track. The budget is detailed, but stands alone, as the only supporting documentation that simply describes the funding match source and amount. Some of the budget items appear to be high for the effort involved, i.e., for the regional description needing 150 hours to describe something that seems to be established already.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Applicant states the geographic extent of this region is the San Francisco Bay Area watershed. However, they state further that the IRWMP will cover the nine Bay Area Counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma, as shown on the map contained in the application. A map showing some of the agencies involved is included in the application. Boundaries relate to the Bay Area watershed, except as noted in cases for which political lines deviate from watershed. County, land use, infrastructure maps, descriptions, and tables were also used.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: Major water related planning objectives are included in Table 1 of the application. Table 4.1 in the "Water Supply Water Quality Functional Area Document" (FAD) lists performance measures for specific sub-objectives under each of the same objectives in Table 1 of the application. The final IRWMP will address major water related objectives and conflicts; however, it is not totally clear that the regional planning objectives were fully explained.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: Task 3.1.5 will integrate the water management strategies developed in Task 3.1.4 for subsequent prioritization under regional priorities by evaluating which ones best meet multiple objectives identified in Task 3.1.3. Additional evaluation of strategies to be included in the IRWMP will take place. The process of integration involves cross comparison with selected objectives. The applicant did not demonstrate how water management strategies will work together or the synergistic benefits of integrating multiple strategies. Integration is proposed to meet challenges and opportunities for collaboration and coordination, but process for how this will actually work was not clearly defined.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The implementation process would be developed as a section of the IRWMP. The work plan would include timelines for implementation activities beyond IRWMP adoption, and the FAD includes a time-line showing project implementation. This section would delineate both performance and corrective measures to be applied if necessary. This section would develop an institutional structure to ensure implementation, but further detail is not provided. The narrative falls short of roles and responsibility assignments.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The applicant states that the IRWMP is not intended to be a CEQA compliance document. Instead, entities responsible for implementing projects have the responsibility of ensuring that all appropriate environmental approvals have been met. Also, IRWMP impacts and benefits are detailed in the finalized FAD. The IRWMP implementation impacts and benefits would be described in the draft impacts and benefits section categorized by water management strategy. The application is not explicit that the final IRWMP will include an analysis of potential impacts and benefits.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Planning documents are the only category listed in the application as "data." Part of the proposal is to collect and document technical methods and analysis with a list of performance measures. Specific types or categories of technical studies to be performed under the work plan are not detailed, though needs for additional data or monitoring will be identified.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Data collected during IRWMP development would be disseminated by a number of means to the stakeholder groups, the public, and State agency programs such as the SWRCB's SWAMP and GAMA. Process for gathering and managing data and who will be in charge is not specific.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Stakeholder involvement concerns associated with projects or plans that overlap jurisdictional boundaries and how they will be handled are not adequately documented or addressed. Without such involvement, implementation may not occur. Process is laid out for stakeholder involvement through four workshops. Stakeholder groups are defined broadly and environmental justice concerns are considered. There appears to be a need to include more ongoing stakeholder involvement and more bottom to top input and involvement. Environmental justice concerns are not addressed in detail. This seems minimal for an effort of this magnitude in a large regional area.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal states that the region includes some DACs, but they are not identified. The water supply/quality needs of DACs are not documented. Representatives of DACs may be included in the process. The proposal states that DAC representatives will be invited to participate in the planning process. The proposal, however, does not show how the proposed IRWMP will directly benefit DACs.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The work plan proposes to incorporate local planning processes and identifies local plans. Dynamics between two levels is addressed in a general way. The applicant states that planning will be via ABAG. One goal of the IRWMP is to relate local plans and identify linkages: for instance, land use and water management. Several types of planning documents are cited for integration, with a specific Task 3.1.13 to include local plans. The application is not clear about whether any of the local planning documents would serve as 'foundational' material for the IRWMP. There is not much accounting for local land use plans specifically, although the linkage is called out in the Letter of Mutual Understanding.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The final plan should define the coordination process and show how to include other agency directives while establishing performance measures to ensure implementation. Issues associated with projects and plans that cross and/or impact other jurisdictions are not addressed even though they are critical with regards to whether the project or plan can be implemented. This proposal and PIN 5038 are both for development of an IRWMP for the Bay Area. This application will address water supply and water quality; while PIN 5038 will address other issues.

TOTAL SCORE: 64